UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,035	04/07/2006	Helmut Jerg	2003P01299WOUS	5947
46726 7590 05/29/2009 BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD			EXAMINER	
			KO, STEPHEN K	
NEW BERN, NC 28562			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/575,035	JERG, HELMUT	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:	ne
a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</u>	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TV MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ΝO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	e as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date o filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for	
appeal; and/or	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	е
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 22,25-27 and 29-39.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. Other:	
/Michael Kornakov/ Examiner, /S.K./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendment to claim 32 introduces new limitation, which has not been previously presented and therefore claim 32 requires at least further consideration and possible search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicants' argument that replacing the entire heat damping layer in DE'822 would require substantial structural modifications, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Moreover, applicants' argument regarding to claim 32 is based on amendment, which is not entered.